

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 SENTHIL MOHAN MURUGAIYAN,
9 Plaintiff,
10 v.
11 KATE ANDERSON, et al.,
12 Defendants.

Case No. [23-cv-05272-CRB](#)

**ORDER ADOPTING R&R AND
DENYING MOTIONS FOR
INJUNCTIONS**

13 The Court has reviewed Magistrate Judge Westmore's Report and Recommendation
14 (dkt. 11) and has considered the objections filed by Plaintiff Senthil Mohan Murugaiyan
15 (dkt. 14). On de novo review, the Court finds the Report correct, well-reasoned, and
16 thorough. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); Civ. L.R. 72-3. The Court therefore overrules
17 Plaintiff's objections and ADOPTS the Report and Recommendation in full.

18 Because Plaintiff's Complaint (dkt. 1) fails to state a claim, it is DISMISSED
19 without prejudice, except for Plaintiff's claims brought under 18 U.S.C. §§ 241, 2703,
20 1702, 1513, and 2261A, which are DISMISSED with prejudice. Accordingly, Plaintiff's
21 motions for a preliminary injunction (dkt. 15) and for a permanent injunction (dkt. 18) are
22 DENIED because Plaintiff has established neither a likelihood of success on the merits nor
23 actual success on the merits.¹ See Amoco Production Co. v. Village of Gambell, AK, 480
24 U.S. 531, 546 n.12 (1987). Additionally, because Plaintiff has failed to allege a cognizable
25 claim, Plaintiff's motion for emergency relief (dkt. 7) is also DENIED.

26 Because Plaintiff's case was transferred to this Court, Plaintiff's motion to expedite
27

28 ¹ The Court finds that these motions are suitable for resolution without oral argument
or further briefing, pursuant to Local Rule 7-1(b).

1 a transfer (dkt. 10) is DENIED as moot.

2 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

3 Dated: February 23, 2024

4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CHARLES R. BREYER
United States District Judge